DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 041 512 FL 001 845

AUTHOR	Smith, Philip D., Jr.
TITLE	In-Service Education Practices of State Foreign Language Supervisors.
INSTITUTION	National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Language.
PUB DATE	Dec 63
NOTE	7p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.45
DESCRIPTORS	Conference Reports, Education Courses, *Inservice Courses, Inservice Education, Inservice Programs, *Inservice Teacher Education, *Language Instruction, *Modern Languages, Professional Training, Program Development, *State Supervisors, Teacher Education, Teacher Workshops

ABSTRACT

This report reviews the practices of the various states represented at the second national Study Conference of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages (May 1963) pertaining to inservice education. Results of a questionnaire distributed to the state supervisors focus on the following topics in this article: (1) types of inservice programs, (2) college-type courses, (3) N.D.E.A. Institutes, (4) curriculum of inservice education, (5) commercial exhibits, (6) initiating programs, (7) financing, (8) time of programs, (9) workshop personnel, (10) materials adoption, and (11) number of programs. Concluding remarks are directed to the improvement of existing programs. (RL)

ED041512

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A Report on

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PRACTICES

OF STATE FOREIGN LANGUAGE SUPERVISORS

prepared by
Philip D. Smith
Foreign Language Consultant
State of NEVADA

For the
National Council of State Supervisors of Foreign Languages

December, 1963

FL001 845

IN-SERVICE EDUCATION PRACTICES
of State Foreign Language Supervisors

During the course of the second national Study Conference of State Supervisors of Foreign Language, sponsored by the United States Office of Education in May, 1963, one of the major topics of discussion was the in-service training of modern language teachers. Mr. André Paquette of New Hampshire led the study assisted by Wilma Jimerson, Lester McKim, James Powers and Dr. James Spillane, Chief of the N.D.E.A. Institute Program.

Near the closing of the conference, it was suggested that several topics be pursued further for the benefit of the State Supervisors. Among these were the current practices of the various states. Philip D. Smith of Nevada was asked by Lester McKim, Coordinating Secretary, to undertake the study. An instrument was finally devised and sent to all current state supervisors and several who had only recently left our ranks.

The questionnaire was returned promptly by an overwhelming majority of the supervisors. Since many items called for more than one answer and since many persons added comments, a rather comprehensive picture of current practices was obtained.

1. Types of In-Service Programs

For the purpose of the study, in-service programs were divided into three catagories - Workshops (of a productive nature), Demonstrations, and Conferences (policy setting). Supervisors indicated that they conducted all three but that "Demonstrations" were the most common.

The geographical distribution or coverage of programs correlates directly with the size, population density, and internal school administration of the state. Supervisory Unions were the lowest-not surprising since these are peculiar to a very few areas mostly in the middle Atlantic and New England States. In Nevada and several other states the "County" and "local" school districts are the same and can even be considered "regional". Sparsely populated or small states hold more state-wide meetings than those with large populations or large areas. What is considered a short distance in one area is far away to another.

Most workshops and demonstrations are held on a <u>regional</u> basis, with the local school district second and county districts third. About half of the responses indicated <u>state</u> programs of this nature.

On the other hand, conferences are held most often at the state level (2/3 of responses) with local districts as second preference and regional a close third.

2. College Type Courses

On question asked if states conducted actual courses in methodology, materials, etc. of college caliber, defined as a sequence of sessions totaling sixteen or more hours duration. Twenty-one of thirty-one responses were in the affirmative. Of these, three-quarters carried academic college credits through arrangement with a local institution of higher learning.

Responses were split evenly between actually sponsoring such courses and cooperating with local universities to have them offer the course. Eight supervisors indicated that they had directly conducted such classes. Ten responses indicated that these were conducted during the school year in the evening hours. The majority, sixteen, had been held in the summer.

3. N.D.E.A. Institutes

Over two-thirds of the state supervisors have directly involved themselves with N.D.E.A. Institutes in some way. Most indicated that they had been active in several ways. Twelve stated that they had initiated the Institute "idea" at universities while more than this had been involved as a consultant in Institute planning. Eleven had become involved to the point that they were directly concerned with instruction and/or administration of an Institute. Thirteen had delivered lectures to Institute classes.

4. Curriculum of In-Service Education

Eighty percent of the supervisors indicated that they had held professional meetings that cut across academic lines to involve elementary, secondary and university personnel together.

The most common theme of in-service training has been on new media, including language laboratories. In second place comes "standard" media. Eleven states indicated workshops on educational television while eight and nine states had worked with supervision and administration. It would seem that the supervisors have not yet reached the guidance counselors - only three supervisors indicated workshops for these people.

5. Commercial Exhibits

Most supervisors indicated that they allow commercial firms to set up materials and media exhibits at workshops if time and space allow. Less than one-fourth indicated that this was not done. The practice of actually allowing commercial concerns to use workshop time for actual demonstrations or structured presentations on their materials found the supervisors sharply divided. Sixteen replied "Yes", sixteen replied "No". Several volunteered statements that this practice was decidedly opposed to State Department policy while other qualified their "Yes" with the words "occasionally" or "rarely".

6. Initiating Programs

Most impetus for in-service education programs comes from the State level. Over three-fourths of the supervisors replied that they initiated programs while only two-thirds of the responses indicated initiation by local school districts.

Only about one-third indicated that individual teachers asked for assistance. Although, one would assume that many requests from both the district and state level reflected the conversation or attitude of one or more teachers in a system.

7. Financing

Almost all in-service training programs in which supervisors are involved are financed by state-federal monies under Title III-B of the N.D.E.A. or regular state "institute" funds. There is no financial burden - save in the use of facilities and released teacher time and travel to the local school.

Only three states indicated that the state and local district had cooperated financially in supporting in-service programs. One supervisor replied that all programs had been done gratis by consultants since no funds were available - a very commendable professional attitude.

8. Time of Programs

There are as many varying times for programs as one can imagine. Most supervisors choose to elaborate in detail on this item in the questionnaire. The actual preferences were one-half day (16), one full day (10), and two days (5). Many indicated a preference for one-half (Friday) plus one full. A great many indicated continuing short sessions totaling between eight and twelve hours.

The time of year seems to be entirely one of personal preference, perhaps dictated by climate. Fourteen responses favor the fall months, thirteen spring. Summer and winter received eight and three votes respectively.

The time of day seems to be the most subjective of all choices with responses split almost evenly three ways, sixteen each for evenings and Saturdays and fourteen favoring the after school hours. One supervisor stated that he found that Saturdays were far better than any other time while another replied that his state had had exceptionally poor results with Saturday meetings.

All supervisors who commented specifically mentioned that the best time was during the school day while teachers were released from regular teaching duties.

In over two-thirds of the states teachers can expect no material reward for attendance at workshops. In some areas the State urges schools to credit in-service programs for salary increments. A very few indicated that teachers received college or university credits.

Most teachers can only expect the reward of increased competence and a feeling of professional growth in their chosen profession.

Only three supervisors states that their states recognized in-service courses for the removal of certification provisions or as credit toward renewal. These programs must be conducted by the State Department of Education.

9. Workshop Personnel

This area of the questionnaire was poorly worded in that, while attempting to find out who helps the state supervisors with workshops, the text read "c. Personnel of your own State Department." From the affirmative answers received (thirty of thirty-three) it is apparent that this was in many ways misinterpreted by state supervisors to include themselves. Their involvement was automatically assumed. The item would have better read "Personnel - other than FL supervisors - of your own State Department." Envisioned as possible resource persons were specialists in English, Title III Administrators, curriculum and A-V specialists, etc.

Most often used personnel in workshops are college instructors and local FL supervisors and teachers. Again, these are distorted by varying conditions in various regions. Some states have few universities solidly entrenched with literary specialists. Some states have none-or only one- district FL supervisor while other states have many. Twenty-one responses indicated use of USOE specialists at one time or another.

Least utilized were the MLA consultants (of whom some <u>are</u> state supervisors) and personnel of other State Departments of Education.

10. Materials Adoptions

More than two-thirds of the supervisors indicated that their programs are not affected or influenced by state-wide text adoptions. This is due to the fact that states, in the main, adopt only for grades K-8 and local option is permitted at the secondary level.

On the other hand, more than half of the responses indicate that programs are tailored to fit the materials in use or contemplated use by schools involved in the program. Negative responses are probably due to involvement of teachers using a wide variety of textual materials.

11. Number of Programs

Supervisors were asked to estimate the number of in-service programs conducted by their state both this year and last. A wide range of responses were received, again utterly dependent upon the population and financial status of the particular state involved. States with large populations and more advantageous tax structures and budgets are simply able - and required - to do more. Minimum allotment states have no Title III-B monies for other than salary and administration requirements.

The average estimate for the 1962-63 school year was twelve with a slightly higher estimate of thirteen for the current year.

Conclusions

The most apparent observations obtainable from the questionnaire is that states are like people, individuals with different physical, educational, and financial backgrounds. All, however, are genuinely interested in providing continuing or in-service education for teachers.

There seem to be several suggestions that occur immediately to help the supervisors in their work. Among these one can see:

1. More use of the MLA Consultants. These are available at no expense. The MLA had to express a definite need for these persons to obtain a financial grant. Local districts, in many areas, are still unaware of their availability. Let us use these people.
2. More use of other state FL supervisors. The supervisors are competent and knowledgable in most aspects of MFL education. Even if they hold the same position as we do ourselves, we must admit that our own effectiveness with some of our own educators has paled. Often living over the state line makes someone an "expert".

Limited finances might make "swapping workshops" feasible. Perhaps MLA monies can be obtained for this purpose. Think of the fringe benefits that could be obtained by more contact with our collegues.

3. Some states have had many of their teachers attend N.D.E.A. Institutes and the program is beginning to look fairly decent. Let us now get to one other head of the hydra and provide more in-service education for school administrators and especially guidance counselors.
4. It would seem that more cooperative state (including Title II, federal) and local financing of workshops might stretch both budgets further. Don't forget that some universities have monies in this area.

* * *

Itemized tabulations of the survey of in-service practices will be mailed to individual state supervisors shortly. This report is brief but submitted in hope that it is the first step in work in depth in this vital area of American education - a work that can never cease, indeed must increase, as the sum of man's knowledge continues to expand.

Philip D. Smith, Jr.
Foreign Language Consultant
Carson City, Nevada
December 18, 1963

PDS:nb